

## REMARKS

In response to the final Office action dated June 11, 2008, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-36 are pending in the present Application. Claims 14-28 have been previously withdrawn. Claims 1, 3, 29, and 30 have been amended and claims 37 and 38 are new, leaving claims 1, 3-13 and 29-38 for consideration upon entry of the present amendments and following remarks.

Support for the amendments to the claims can at least be found in the specification, the figures, and the claims, and more particularly in FIGS. 1-3, as originally filed.

No new matter has been introduced by these amendments. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1, 3-5, 13, 29-32, 35 and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Ishida et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,057,678, hereinafter "Ishida"). The Examiner states that Ishida discloses all of the elements of the abovementioned claims primarily in FIG. 1 and columns 1 and 2 of Ishida. Applicants respectfully traverse.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Independent claim 1, and similarly in independent claim 29, has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, a first connector installed on the first board to electrically connect the first electrodes that are coupled to the first board to an inverter that generates the first discharge voltage, **the first connector being disposed between the two first through-holes.**

It is respectfully submitted that a cable 15 in FIG. 4 of Ishida relied upon and equated to the claimed "connector" on page 4 of the Detailed Action is not equivalent to the connector 129 (or 139) in accordance with the present invention. More specifically, according to FIG. 4 and column 6, lines 33-43 of Ishida, the cable 15 is connected at an end thereof to the return substrate

8. That is, Ishida does not disclose the connector 129 (or 139) disposed between the two first through-holes 125 (or 135) as illustrated in FIGS. 1-3 of the present invention.

In particular, Ishida does not teach or suggest, a first connector installed on the first board to electrically connect the first electrodes that are coupled to the first board to an inverter that generates the first discharge voltage, the first connector being disposed between the two first through-holes, as recited in amended independent claim 1, and similarly recited in amended independent claim 29. Thus Claims 1 and 29, including claims depending therefrom, i.e., Claims 2-13 and 30-36, define over Ishida.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claims 1, 3-5, 13, 29-32, 35 and 36 under § 103(a) be withdrawn.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 6 and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Ishida in view of Saito et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,441,874, hereinafter “Saito”). The Examiner states that Ishida discloses all of the elements of the abovementioned claims except, *the first holder comprising rubber*, which the Examiner further states is disclosed primarily in FIGS. 1-7 of Saito. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claims 7-11 and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Ishida et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,057,678, hereinafter “Ishida”) in view of Oyokata et al. (Japanese Patent No. 2002-132193, hereinafter “Oyokata”). The Examiner states that Ishida discloses all of the elements of the abovementioned claims except, *a second board, coupled to the second electrode, for providing the second electrode with the second discharge voltage*, which the Examiner further states is disclosed primarily in FIGS. 1, 4 and 5 of Oyokata. Applicants respectfully traverse.

For an obviousness rejection to be proper, the Examiner must meet the burden of establishing that all elements of the invention are disclosed in the prior art and that the prior art relied upon, coupled with knowledge generally available in the art at the time of the invention, must contain some suggestion or incentive that would have motivated the skilled artisan to modify a reference or combined references. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir.

1988); *In Re Wilson*, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970); *Amgen v. Chugai Pharmaceuticals Co.*, 927 U.S.P.Q.2d, 1016, 1023 (Fed. Cir. 1996).

First, it is respectfully submitted that Oyokota discloses a lighting installation that is constituted to illuminate an object for illumination from its rear with the transmitted light from the cold cathode fluorescent tubes [2] having electrodes at each of both ends in the axial direction of the tubes by impressing high-frequency voltages from inverter circuits to the fluorescent tubes [2]. The plurality of the fluorescent tubes [2] are disposed nearly parallel to each other and circuit boards 14 formed with the inverter circuits are disposed at each one-side end of the plurality of the fluorescent tubes [2] or near the same and the high-frequency output side output terminals Vo of the inverter circuits are connected to the electrodes disposed to each one-side end of the fluorescent tubes [2]. (Abstract). Oyokota further discloses with reference to FIGS. 1 and 3 thereof that one end of each lamp [2] is disposed in a corresponding groove [9a] of a lamp holder rail [9] and sandwiched with another lamp holder rail [10]. A pair of stacked inverter circuit substrates [14] are disposed over a respective lamp holder with a member [11] disposed therebetween.

It is respectfully noted that independent claims 1 and 29 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly define over Ishida. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that use of the rubber lamp holder or any other disclosure of Saito does not cure the deficiencies noted above with respect to Ishida.

More specifically, neither Ishida nor Saito, either alone or in combination, disclose “a first insulated body 121 having a first inward surface that makes contact with the first lamp holder 127 and a first outward surface on which a first conductive pattern 123 is formed.” FIGS. 1-4 of Ishida disclose a conductive substrate 8 electrically connected to an inverter substrate 17 through a cable 15. However, according to the present invention, the first board 120 includes a first insulated body 121, and a first conductive pattern 123 is formed on the first outward surface of the first insulated body.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that Ishida does not disclose “a first connector 129 installed on the first board 120 to electrically connect the first electrodes that are coupled to the first board to an inverter 140 that generates the first discharge voltage.” The Examiner alleges on page 5 of the present Office Action that Ishida discloses a connector [column 2, lines 15-19

and FIG. 4: (15)]. However, the reference number 15 indicates a cable that does not correspond to the first connector 129 but corresponds to a line 142 of the present invention. Moreover, the cable 15 is not installed on the first board.

Neither Ishida nor Oyokata, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest, a first connector installed on the first board to electrically connect the first electrodes that are coupled to the first board to an inverter that generates the first discharge voltage, **the first connector being disposed between the two first through-holes**, as recited in amended independent claim 1, and similarly recited in amended independent claim 29. Thus Claims 1 and 29, including claims depending therefrom, i.e., Claims 2-13 and 30-36, define over Ishida in view of Oyokata.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claims 6, 12 and 33 under § 103(a) be withdrawn.

With respect to the rejection of claims 7-11 and 34, first, it is respectfully noted claims 7-11 depend from claim 1, while claim 34 depends from claim 29, both of which claims are submitted as being allowable for defining over Ishida as discussed above. Further, it is respectfully submitted that use of the two boards of Oyokota does not cure the deficiencies noted above with respect to Ishida.

Moreover, the Examiner admits on page 7 of the previous Office Action that Ishida does not disclose the first board having at least two first through-holes formed on the insulated body, whereby the each of the first through-holes receives the first electrode of each of the lamps.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishida in view of Oyokota as applied to Claim 7 above (which limitations are included in Claim 1, as amended), and further in view of Saito. Applicants respectfully traverse.

As discussed above, dependent claims inherit all of the limitations of the respective parent claim.

Claims 7-12 and 34 variously depend from claims 1 and 29. As discussed above, Ishida does not teach or suggest at least all of the limitations of at least amended claims 1 and 29. Saito also does not teach at least all of the limitations of amended claims 1 and 29. Therefore, Saito does not remedy the deficiencies of Ishida and Mazis with respect to amended Claims 1 and 29.

Accordingly, Ishida, Oyokata, Mazis and Saito do not teach all of the limitations of Claims 6, 8-12, 33 and 34.

Since Ishida, Oyokota and Saito, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all of the limitations of at least Claims 6, 8-12, 33 and 34, *prima facie* obviousness does not exist regarding Claims 6, 8-12, 33 and 34 with respect to the Ishida, Oyokota and Saito patents.

Additionally, since Ishida, Oyokota and Saito fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of Claims 6, 8-12, 33 and 34, clearly, one of ordinary skill at the time of Applicants' invention would not have a motivation to modify or combine the references, or a reasonable likelihood of success in forming the claimed invention by modifying or combining the references. Thus, here again, *prima facie* does not exist.

Thus, *prime facie* obviousness does not exist regarding Claims 6, 8-12, 33 and 34 with respect to the Ishida, Oyokota and Saito patents. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 6, 8-12, 33 and 34 are not further rejected or objected and are therefore allowable. Reconsideration and allowance of Claims 6, 8-12, 33 and 34 is respectfully requested.

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicants' attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: /James J. Merrick/  
James J. Merrick  
Reg. No. 43,801  
Confirmation No. 2199  
CANTOR COLBURN LLP  
20 Church Street, 22<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Hartford, CT 06103  
PTO Customer No. 23413  
Telephone (860) 286-2929  
Facsimile (860) 286-0115

Date: September 11, 2008